

Defendants.

:
 :
 :
 :
 : Civil Action No.: 9:12-cv-2920-SB
 :
 :
 : **COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR**
 : **JURY TRIAL**
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :

4. The Plaintiff, Lynn Allbright (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in Hampton, South Carolina, and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant GC Services, L.P. (“GC”), is a Texas business entity with an address of 6330 Gulfton Street, Houston, Texas 77081, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by GC and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. GC at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$19,000.00 (the “Debt”) to Sallie Mae (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to GC for collection, or GC was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. GC Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. On or around May 29, 2012, Defendants began contacting Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. Defendants placed up to five calls daily to Plaintiff’s cellular phone.

14. On numerous occasions, Plaintiff requested that Defendants cease calling her as she worked at night and could not take the calls early in the morning.

15. Nonetheless, Defendants continued to call Plaintiff.

16. During phone conversations, Defendants were irate with Plaintiff and yelled at her.

17. In a conversation on July 25, 2012, Defendants threatened to garnish Plaintiff's wages. Plaintiff, however, has yet to receive any notice of garnishment.

18. In an additional conversation that day, "Cherie" from Defendants told Plaintiff they were going to consolidate the loan and then proceeded to demand \$200.00 a month toward payment of the Debt. Plaintiff explained that she could only pay \$50.00 because she had to pay other student loans and had a child to feed. Cherie responded that she did not care, that Plaintiff needed to better prioritize her payments, and that Plaintiff's situation was her own fault.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

19. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

20. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT –
15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

21. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendants used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4) in that Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with garnishment if the debt was not paid.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

28. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

29. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
WRONGFUL INTRUSION INTO PRIVATE AFFAIRS

30. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

31. South Carolina state law recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy in such a manner as to outrage or cause serious mental suffering, shame, and humiliation to Plaintiff; thus, the Defendants violated South Carolina state law.

32. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with phone calls to her home.

33. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiffs were so persistent and repeated with such frequency that they caused serious mental suffering, shame, and humiliation to Plaintiff thus satisfying the state law requirement for an invasion of privacy.

34. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities demonstrated blatant and shocking disregard of Plaintiff's rights and resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

35. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

36. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);
4. Actual damages from the Defendants for all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent

FDCPA violations and intentional and/or reckless invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;

5. Punitive damages; and
6. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: October 10, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Brian J. Headley

Brian J. Headley, Attorney at Law
District of South Carolina Bar ID No. 11427
145 Historic Drive
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
Telephone: (855) 301-2100 Ext. 5532
Facsimile: (888) 953-6237
bjheadley@yahoo.com
bheadley@leberglaw.com

Of Counsel To
Sergei Lemberg
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
A Connecticut Law Firm
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (888) 953-6237